

AN ANALYSIS OF RECLDIVISM AMONG CONVICTED MURDERERS

Massachusetts Department of Correction

John A. Gavin
Commissioner

Researchers:

Iygere Panagopoulos
Carroll T. Miller
Research Analysts,
Division of Legal Medicine

Social Science Research Specialist

Francis J. Carney

First Printing February, 1970
Second Printing October, 1971

Publication of this Document Approved by Alfred C. Holland, State
Purchasing Agent

No. 5882

This study is part of a joint research effort of the Massachusetts
Department of Correction and the Massachusetts Department of Mental
Health, Division of Legal Medicine

INTRODUCTION

This study will present an analysis of convicted murderers released in Massachusetts over a ten year period.¹ Where possible they will be compared with other offenders. In a second section the factors related to recidivism among the convicted murderer releasees will be described.

A description of the law governing the eligibility for parole of convicted murderers in Massachusetts will introduce the study. Inmates convicted of first degree murder and sentenced to life, for whom the jury recommend mercy, were eligible for parole if the Governor, with the consent of the Executive Council, commuted their sentence to a term of years. Inmates convicted of second degree murder and sentenced to life were, until 1965, eligible to see the parole board after having served twenty years of their term and, since 1965, after having served fifteen years of their term. They could also seek to have their sentences commuted. If this were granted, their parole eligibility would be calculated according to the new minimum and maximum sentences given.

1 The authors are indebted to Susan Kress and Frank Munsey of Tufts University for their assistance in the collection of data for this study.

CONVICTED MURDERER RELEASEES DESCRIBED, AND COMPARED WITH OTHER OFFENDER RELEASEES

Method. The sample in this study consists of the 92 convicted murderers released in Massachusetts between 1957 and 1966 inclusive, who were being paroled for the first time on this sentence. To reiterate, this study does not focus on all convicted murderers, but only on convicted murderers who have been released.² Comparison data on other offenders were taken from Base Expectancy Studies done at Walpole and Norfolk.³ This comparison sample of 507 men consists of all inmates, excluding convicted murderers, released from Walpole and Norfolk during 1960.

The data for this study were collected from the folders of the inmates. The factors analyzed fell into six general categories: (A) Background Factors, (B) Criminal History, (C) Present Offense, (D) Institutional Behavior, (E) Release Data, and (F) Post-Release Data. The results are presented in the appendix and summarized in the text below.

Background Factors (Appendix I, Table A). The sample of convicted murderer releasees was 96.7% male and 81.5% white. At commitment, the average age was 28 years, and the average education level was eight grades. This sample was slightly younger and had a slightly smaller percentage of Blacks than was the case for the other offender releasees. However, both differences were small and not statistically significant. At commitment 47.8% were married, 16.3% were separated or divorced, and 15.2% were committed for the murder of their spouse. A significantly larger percentage of the convicted murderers (69.6%) had no military service than was the case for the other offenders (52.8%).

Criminal History (Table B). The convicted murderers had a much less serious criminal history than did the other offenders. Only 21.7% of the

2 For a description of all convicted murderers, see: Francis J. Carney, Alan Tosti and Alex Turchette, "An Analysis of Convicted Murderers in Massachusetts, 1943-1966," Massachusetts Department of Correction, mimeographed, June, 1968.

3 Francis J. Carney, "Predicting Recidivism in a Maximum Security Institution: Some Emerging Generalizations," Massachusetts Department of Correction, mimeographed, October, 1966.

convicted murderers had six or more prior arrests, as compared to 70.2% of the other offenders. Breaking the arrests down, 27.2% of the convicted murderers had been previously arrested for drunkenness, 28.3% for offenses against the person, 43.5% for offenses against property, and 6.5% for sex offenses. Only 33.7% of the convicted murderers had prior federal, state or House of Correction incarcerations, as compared to 73.2% of the other offenders. Breaking this down, 14.1% of the convicted murderers had prior state or federal incarcerations, and 23.9% had prior House of Correction incarcerations. In addition, 14.1% had prior juvenile incarcerations. The average age at first arrest was 21 years, and 55.4% were first arrested between 13 and 20 years of age. The ages at first arrest of the convicted murderers and of the other offenders did not differ significantly.

Present Offense (Table C). Only 5.4% of the releasees were committed for first degree murder, while 84.8% were committed for second degree murder and 7.6% were committed for second degree murder in conjunction with another offense. (Those convicted of first degree murder are unlikely to be released. To be eligible for parole they need two commutations, one from a death sentence and another from a life sentence.) The methods of murder were as follows: shooting 36.9%, stabbing 15.2%, strangling 10.9%, clubbing 20.6%, beating 14.1%, and drowning 2.2%. The most common motives for the murder were robbery 41.3%, prior arguments 14.1%, isolated arguments 11.9%, jealousy 9.8%, and sex gratification 6.5%. The victims were 22.1% relatives, 11.6% friends, 25.2% acquaintances, 34.7% strangers, and 3.2% law officers. In 22.8% of the cases a male murdered his present or former wife or girlfriend, and in 48.9% of the cases a male murdered a male stranger or acquaintance.

Institutional Behavior (Table D). More of the convicted murderers

had spent days in isolation (44.5%) than had other offenders (19.1%).

This difference is probably related to their longer incarcerations, as 29.0% of those incarcerated under fifteen years and 50.8% of those incarcerated fifteen years or more spent days in isolation. The most common disciplinary reports were insolence and disobedience 50.0% (of the men were reported for the offense), non-drug contraband 37.0%, physical aggression 26.1%, and under the influence 9.8%.

Release Data (Table E). The average age at release was 45 years, and the average length of incarceration was 17 years. The largest percentage of inmates were released from Norfolk (68.5%), followed by Walpole with 23.9%. The largest number of men (19) was released in 1966, just after the law concerning eligibility for parole was changed. Of the 92 inmates released, 51 had their sentences commuted. The mean time from commitment to commutation was 13.5 years; 41.2% were released within a month of commutation and 80.4% within six months of commutation.

Post-Release Data (Table F). As of mid-1969, 65.2% of the ninety-two convicted murderers released between 1957 and 1966 were still on parole, 7.6% had had their paroles terminated, 7.6% had died, and 19.6% had been reincarcerated (Table F, 1). The extent of recidivism may be described in two ways: (1) of the ninety-two convicted murderers released between 1957 and 1966, eighteen (or 19.6%) had been reincarcerated by mid-1969, (2) of the

seventy convicted murderers released between 1957 and mid-1965, nine (or 12.8%) were reincarcerated within the first four years after release.

Over the four-year follow-up period just described, the recidivism rate of convicted murderer releasees was much lower than the recidivism rate of the other offender releasees. After one year 1.1% of the convicted murderers and 35.5% of the other offenders had been returned. After two years 4.4% of the convicted murderers and 47.9% of the other offenders had been returned. After four years 12.8% of the convicted murderers and 59.5% of the other offenders had been returned (Table F, 3).

However, if the recidivists were re-released they had a very high recidivism rate. Of the eighteen releasees who had been reincarcerated by mid-1969, eleven had been released again. Eight of these eleven were returned again, five within one month of release. This leads to an interesting conclusion: Convicted murderer releasees have a low recidivism rate; however, if they are returned to prison then released a second time, they have a very high recidivism rate.

Why were the recidivists returned to prison? Of the eighteen reincarcerated, eight were returned on technical parole violations, eight as parole violators with a new arrest, and two on a new commitment. Their new offenses are described in Appendix I, Table F, 2. Four of these new offenses were against the person. They included one case each of murder, assault with intent to murder, indecent assault and battery, and assault and battery by means of a dangerous weapon.

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH RECIDIVISM AMONG CONVICTED MURDERER RELEASEES

Method. The recidivists and non-recidivists were compared on all the factors described in the preceding section of the paper. As mentioned before, it was possible to compare two different groups of recidivists and non-recidivists: (1) those who did or did not become recidivists during the four years after release, and (2) those released between 1957 and 1966 who had or had not become recidivists by mid-1969. The first method was rejected with the reasoning that the clarity of comparing recidivists and non-recidivists during a four-year follow-up rather than during a follow-up varying from three to thirteen years would be outweighed by the lesser reliability of results based on nine (rather than eighteen) recidivists. Thus the total sample of ninety-two convicted murderers was used in the comparison. This included eighteen recidivists, of whom one was reincarcerated in the first year after release, three in the second year, two in the third year, six in the fourth year, two in the fifth year, three in the sixth year, and one in the eighth year (Table F, 4).

However, to some extent the comparison^{used} does not matter, since the results for both comparisons are quite similar, with the exception of the relation of criminal history to recidivism. Some differences in the two sets of results are described in Appendix III for the interested reader.

Finally, it cannot be emphasized too strongly that the results below are based on a small number of cases and therefore tend to be unreliable.

Background Factors (Appendix I, Table A). Inmates younger at commitment and younger at release--and those single and with no military service--were more likely to become recidivists. The recidivism rate was higher for those under 25 at commitment (35.9%) than for those 25 and over at commitment (7.5%) and similarly higher for those under 40 at release (29.0%) than for those 40 and over at release (14.6%). Those single at commitment had a higher return rate (34.9%) than those married, widowed, separated or divorced (6.2%). Twenty-five percent of those without military service and 7.1% of those with military service were returned. The return rate varied little according to race or educational level, and none of the three female convicted murderers released were returned.

Criminal History (Table B). Those more likely to become recidivists were younger at first arrest and had some prior arrests. Those 19 or younger at first arrest had a return rate of 26.3%, while those 20 or older at first arrest had a return rate of 8.6%. Those with some prior arrests had a recidivism rate of 23.2%, while those with no prior arrests had a recidivism rate of 8.7%.

However, the individual components of prior arrest tend not to be related to recidivism. The return rate was about the same for those with no (21.2%) or some (15.4%) prior arrests for offenses against the person, for those with no (17.6%) or some (22.5%) prior arrests for offenses against property, and for those with no (19.3%) or some (16.7%) prior arrests for sex offenses. However, those with no prior arrests for drunkenness (13.2%) and those with two or more prior arrests for drunkenness (18.2%) had higher recidivism rates than those with one prior arrest for drunkenness (0.0%).

The number of prior incarcerations is not so clearly related to recidivism as is the case for prior arrests. The return rate is about the same for those with no (19.0%) or some (23.1%) prior state or federal incarcerations and for those with no (20.0%) or some (18.2%) prior House of Correction incarcerations. The

return rate of those with some juvenile incarcerations is higher (38.5%) than that of those with no juvenile incarcerations (16.5%). It should be noted that over the four-year follow-up period the recidivism rate was higher for those with some prior juvenile incarcerations and for those with some prior House of Correction incarcerations. In addition, the return rate was similar for those with some prior state or federal incarcerations as it was for those with no prior state or federal incarcerations. Thus having a prior state or federal incarceration was not related to recidivism over either follow-up period, having a prior House of Correction incarceration was related to recidivism over the four-year follow-up but not over the two to thirteen year follow-up, and having a prior juvenile incarceration was related to recidivism over the two to thirteen year follow-up but was negatively related to recidivism over the four-year follow-up. In view of these contradictory results, it is perhaps best to conclude that there is no relation between prior incarcerations and recidivism.

Present Offense (Table C). None of the thirty releasees who murdered relatives or friends became recidivists. On the other hand, 29.3% of those murdering strangers, acquaintances or law officers became recidivists.

The methods and motives more common in the murder of strangers, acquaintances or law officers had particularly high recidivism rates associated with them. This was true of the methods of clubbing and strangling and of the motives of robbery, isolated argument and sex gratification. The return rate was high when the method of murder was shooting (26.7%), clubbing (26.3%) or strangling (30.0%) but low when the method used was stabbing (7.1%), beating (7.7%) or drowning (0.0%). Similarly, the return rate was high when the motive for murder was robbery (34.2%), isolated argument (18.2%), or sex gratification (33.3%), while there were no recidivists among those motivated by jealousy, the culmination of prior arguments, mercy killing, or escaping immediate arrest.

Institutional Behavior and Release Data (Table D). Those more likely to become recidivists had longer incarcerations, more disciplinary reports, more days of isolation and were released from Walpole rather than Norfolk. The return rate was higher among convicted murderers incarcerated fifteen years or more (24.6%) than among those incarcerated less than fifteen years (9.7%). It was higher among those with six or more disciplinary reports (57.1%) than among those with one to five disciplinary reports (9.3%) or those with no disciplinary reports (17.1%). It was similarly higher among those with one or more days in isolation (60.5%) than among those with no days in isolation (14.6%). It was higher among those released from Walpole (26.7%) than among those released from Norfolk (8.2%).

Factors Combined. Some interesting results emerge when we combine certain of the factors above. None of the thirty releasees with friends or relatives as victims were recidivists. When the victim was a stranger, acquaintance or law officer, the recidivism rate was low when the releasee was twenty-five or older at commitment (14.3%) but high when the releasee was under twenty-five at commitment (41.3%). Within the latter category, those incarcerated more than fifteen years had a higher return rate (55.0%) than those incarcerated fifteen or fewer years (21.4%). Thus, the best recidivism risks among this sample of convicted murderers were those whose victims were friends or relatives (recidivism rate = 0.0%), while the worst recidivism risks were those whose victims were not friends or relatives, who were young at commitment, and who were incarcerated for more than 15 years (recidivism rate = 55.0%). These results are presented in the table in Appendix II.

SUMMARY

In this study the 92 convicted murderers released in Massachusetts between 1957 and 1966 were described, as well as compared to a sample of other offenders released from Walpole and Norfolk during 1960. In addition, the factors related to recidivism were analyzed.

The sample of convicted murder releasees averaged at commitment 28 years of age and eight years of education. It was 81.5% white, 47.8% single and 69.6% without military service. All but three of the ninety-two releasees were male.

The sample averaged 21 years of age at first arrest and overall had less serious criminal histories than the other offender sample. Indeed, 78.3% of the convicted murderer releasees, but only 29.8% of the other offenders, had five or fewer prior arrests, and 66.3% of the convicted murderer releasees, but only 26.8% of the other offenders, had no prior House of Correction, state or federal incarcerations.

Ninety-two percent of the convicted murderer releasees were convicted of second degree murder, either alone or in conjunction with another offense. Forty-nine percent of the victims were male strangers or acquaintances, and 22.8% were wives or girlfriends. The most common method of murder was shooting (26.7), and the most common motive for murder was robbery (34.2%).

More of the convicted murderer releasees had spent days in isolation (44.5%) than had the other offenders (19.1%). This difference is probably related to the much longer incarcerations of the convicted murderer releasees. Thirty-eight percent had no disciplinary reports and 46.7% had from one to four disciplinary reports. The average releasee spent 17 years in prison and was 45 years old at the time of release. Sixty-eight percent were released from Norfolk and 23.9% from Walpole; 55.4% had their sentences commuted.

During a follow-up period of four years, the convicted murderers had a much lower recidivism rate (12.8%) than did the other offenders (59.7%). However, eight of the eleven convicted murderers released a second time were returned a second time. Thus the convicted murderers have a very low recidivism rate upon first release from an incarceration for murder but a very high recidivism rate upon subsequent releases. Of the eighteen men released between 1957 and 1966 and returned by mid-1969, eight were returned on technical parole violations, eight as parole violators with a new arrest, and two on a new commitment.

Over a follow-up period varying from two to thirteen years, the recidivism rate was higher among the convicted murderers who were younger at commitment, younger at release, single and with no military service. It was higher when the victim was a stranger, acquaintance or law officer than when the victim was a relative or friend. It was also higher among those with longer incarcerations, with more disciplinary reports, with more days of isolation, and released from Walpole. The return rate was higher among those younger at first arrest and with some prior arrests. However, the other aspects of criminal history were not clearly related to recidivism.

Combining these factors, we find no recidivists among the releasees convicted of murdering friends or relatives. Among those murdering strangers, acquaintances or law officers, the return rate was lower (14.3%) among releasees 25 or older at commitment than among releasees under 25 at commitment (41.2%).

APPENDIX I

STATISTICAL DATA FOR CONVICTED MURDERER RELEASEE STUDY

A. <u>BACKGROUND FACTORS</u>	<u>MURDERERS</u>			<u>OTHER OFFENDERS</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>(%)</u>	<u>RECIDIVISM RATE</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>(%)</u>
1. <u>Age at Commitment</u>					
24 years or younger	39	(42.4%)	35.9%	164	(32.3%)
25 years or older	53	(57.6%)	7.5%	343	(67.7%)
	mean = 28 $x^2 = 3.51$ $.05 < p < .1$				
2. <u>Race</u>					
White	75	(81.5%)	20.0%	394	(77.7%)
Non-white	17	(18.5%)	17.6%	113	(22.3%)
	$x^2 = .66$ $.1 < p < .5$				
3. <u>Sex</u>					
Male	89	(96.7%)	20.2%		
Female	3	(3.3%)	0.0%		
4. <u>Marital Status</u>					
Single	44	(47.8%)	34.9%		
Married	13	(14.1%)	15.4%		
Separated	3	(3.3%)	0.0%		
Divorced	12	(13.0%)	8.3%		
Widowed	6, 20	(21.7%)	0.0%		
" - killed spouse	14		0.0%		
5. <u>Military Service</u>					
None	64	(69.6%)	25.0%	268	(52.8%)
Honorable	16	(17.4%)	6.7%	148	(29.2%)
Dishonorable* or medical	12	(13.0%)	8.3%	91	(17.9%)
	$x^2 = 8.96$ $.01 < p < .02$				
6. <u>Education-Last grade completed</u>					
0-8 grades, special classes	56	(60.9%)	17.9%		
9 grades or higher	33	(35.9%)	24.2%		
Unknown	3	(3.3%)	0.0%		

* Includes other than honorable, dishonorable, and undesirable

B. CRIMINAL HISTORYMURDERERSOTHER OFFENDERS

	<u>N</u>	<u>(%)</u>	<u>RECIDIVISM RATE</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>(%)</u>
<u>1. Age at first arrest</u>					
19 years or younger	57	(62.0%)	26.3%	352	(69.4%)
20 years or older	35	(38.0%)	8.6%	155	(30.6%)
mean = 21 $x^2 = 2.01$ $.1 < p < .5$					
<u>2. Number of prior arrests</u>					
5 or fewer	72	(78.3%)	22.2%	151	(29.8%)
6 or more	20	(21.7%)	10.0%	356	(70.2%)
$x^2 = 78.3$ $p < .001$					
<u>3. Number of prior arrests for drunkenness</u>					
None	67	(72.8%)	19.4%		
1	11	(12.0%)	10.0%		
2 or more	14	(15.2%)	28.6%		
<u>4. Prior arrests for offenses against the person</u>					
None	66	(71.7%)	21.2%		
Some	26	(28.3%)	15.4%		
<u>5. Prior arrests for offenses against property</u>					
None	52	(56.5%)	17.6%		
Some	40	(43.5%)	22.5%		
<u>6. Prior arrests for sex offenses</u>					
None	86	(93.5%)	19.3%		
Some	6	(6.5%)	16.7%		
<u>7. Number of state or federal incarcerations</u>					
None	79	(85.9%)	19.0%		
Some	13	(14.1%)	23.1%		
<u>8. Number of House of Correction incarcerations</u>					
None	70	(76.1%)	20.0%		
Some	22	(23.9%)	18.2%		
<u>9. Number of juvenile incarcerations</u>					
None	79	(85.9%)	16.5%		
Some	13	(14.1%)	38.5%		
<u>10. Prior Penal Incarcerations (House of Correction, state or federal)</u>					
None	61	(66.3%)	19.7%	136	(26.8%)
Some	31	(33.7%)	19.3%	371	(73.2%)
$x^2 = 54.99$ $p < .001$					

C. PRESENT OFFENSE

MURDERERS

<u>1. Offense</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>(%)</u>	<u>RECIDIVISM RATE</u>
Murder, 1st	5	(5.4%)	20.0%
Murder, 2nd	78	(84.8%)	17.9%
Murder, 2nd; Asslt. int. mur.	2	(2.2%)	0.0%
Murder, 2nd; Armed robbery	4	(4.3%)	75.0%
Murder, 2nd; Rape	1	(1.1%)	0.0%
Acc. before the fact of mur.	2	(2.2%)	0.0%
 <u>2. Relationship of victim to subject</u>			
Spouse	14	(15.8%)	0.0%
Ex-spouse	1	(1.1%)	0.0%
Parent	3	(3.2%)	0.0%
Child	1	(1.1%)	0.0%
Sibling	1	(1.1%)	0.0%
Girlfriend	6	(6.5%)	0.0%
Ex-girlfriend	1	(1.1%)	0.0%
Friend-same sex	3	(3.2%)	0.0%
Acquaintance-opposite sex	10	(10.9%)	30.0%
Acquaintance-same sex	16	(17.4%)	25.0%
Stranger-opposite sex	4	(4.3%)	25.0%
Stranger-same sex	29	(30.5%)	34.5%
Law officer	3	(3.2%)	0.0%
 <u>3. Method of Murder</u>			
Shoot	34	(36.9%)	26.7%
Club	19	(20.9%)	26.3%
Strangle	10	(10.9%)	30.0%
Stab	14	(15.2%)	7.1%
Beat	13	(14.1%)	7.7%
Drown	2	(2.2%)	0.0%
 <u>4. Motive for Murder</u>			
Robbery	38	(41.5%)	34.2%
Isolated argument	11	(11.9%)	18.2%
Sex gratification	6	(6.5%)	33.3%
Culmination of prior arguments	13	(14.1%)	0.0%
Jealousy	9	(9.8%)	0.0%
Mercy killing	1	(1.1%)	0.0%
Escape immediate arrest	3	(3.2%)	0.0%
Other	11	(11.9%)	9.1%

0.0%

29.0%

D. INSTITUTIONAL BEHAVIOR

MURDERERS

OTHER OFFENDERS

N (%)

RECIDIVISM RATE

N (%)

1. Number of Disciplinary Reports

None	35	(38.0%)	17.1%
1-5	43	(46.7%)	9.3%
6 or more	14	(15.2%)	57.1%

2. Days in Isolation

None	51	(55.4%)	14.6%	410	(80.9%)
1 or more	41	(44.5%)	60.0%	97	(19.1%)

$x^2 = 31.87$ $p < .001$

3. Types of Disciplinary Reports (Number of disciplinary reports)

	None	One	Two or More
Insolence, disobedience	46 (50.0%)	18 (19.6%)	28 (30.4%)
Contraband, non-drug	58 (63.0%)	16 (17.4%)	18 (19.6%)
Physical Aggression	68 (73.9%)	14 (15.2%)	10 (10.9%)
Under the influence	83 (90.2%)	8 (8.7%)	1 (1.1%)
Destruction state property	87 (94.6%)	4 (4.3%)	1 (1.1%)
Contraband-drug	87 (94.6%)	4 (4.3%)	1 (1.1%)
Homosexual behavior	88 (95.7%)	4 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)

E. RELEASE DATA

1. Time from commitment to commutation

Less than 10 years	11	(21.6%)	9.1%
10-14 years	17	(33.3%)	17.6%
15-19 years	21	(41.2%)	19.0%
20 or more years	2	(3.9%)	50.0%

2. Time from commutation to release

Within one month	21	(41.2%)	14.3%
1-5 months	20	(39.2%)	25.0%
6 months or over	10	(19.6%)	10.0%

3. Year released

1957	6	50.0%
1958	13	7.7%
1959	7	14.3%
1960	12	16.7%
1961	12	41.7%
1962	5	20.0%
1963	9	11.1%
1964	2	0.0%
1965	7	28.6%
1966	19	10.5%

4. Institution released from N (%) RECIDIVISM RATE

Walpole	22	(23.9%)	36.4%
Norfolk	63	(68.5%)	14.3%
Concord	2	(2.2%)	0.0%
Forestry	1	(1.1%)	0.0%
Framingham	3	(3.3%)	0.0%
State Farm	1	(1.1%)	100.0%

5. Age at release

20-29	7	(7.6%)	42.9%	29.0%
30-39	24	(26.1%)	25.0%	
40-49	35	(38.0%)	14.3%	
50-59	12	(13.0%)	16.7%	14.6%
60 or more	14	(15.2%)	14.3%	

mean = 45 years

6. Length of incarceration

Up to 10	9	(9.8%)	11.1%	9.7%	mean = 17 years mode = 20 "
10-14	22	(23.9%)	9.9%		
15-19	40	(43.5%)	20.0%	24.6%	
20 or more	21	(22.8%)	33.3%		

F. POST-RELEASE DATA

1. Parole Outcome by Year of Release

Year Released	Total	Still on Parole	Revoked and Returned	Died	Terminated
1966	19	17	2	0	0
1965	7	5	2	0	0
1964	2	2	0	0	0
1963	9	7	1	0	1
1962	5	4	1	0	0
1961	12	6	5	0	1
1960	12	7	2	3	0
1959	7	5	1	1	0
1958	13	4	1	3	5
1957	6	3	3	0	0
Total	92	60 (65.3%)	18 (19.6%)	7 (7.6%)	7 (7.6%)

2. Reason for Return

Parole Violation

Technical Violation 8
(no new arrest)

New Arrest for:

Assault with intent to murder 1
Indecent assault and battery 1
Carrying dangerous weapon 2
Breaking and Entering 1
Operating under influence 1
Motor vehicle violation 1
Obscene letter 1

Reason for Return (continued)

New Commitment	Revoked and Returned
Murder	1
Assault & battery by means of a dangerous weapon	<u>1</u>
Total	18

3. Recidivism Rates during Four-Year Follow-up

Follow-up Period	Convicted Murderers	Other Offenders	Difference
1 month	0.0%	4.5%	$\chi^2 = 4.34$.02 < p < .05
6 months	0.0%	20.5%	$\chi^2 = 22.84$ p < .001
1 year	1.1%	35.5%	$\chi^2 = 43.74$ p < .001
2 years	4.4%	47.9%	$\chi^2 = 61.0$ p < .001
4 years	12.8% *	59.9%	$\chi^2 = 54.0$ p < .001

* This percentage is based on N=70 because 22 subjects had not yet been out four years. Three out of these were recidivists. Six who later became recidivists were non-recidivists after four years: see table F, 4.

4. When Returned to Prison

1st year	1
2nd year	3
3rd year	2
4th year	6
5th year	2
6th year	3
7th year	0
8th year	1

mean = $3\frac{1}{2}$ years

APPENDIX II

RECIDIVISM RATES BY TYPE OF RELEASEE

N =

RETURN RATE =

		Victim Friend or Relative	30	0.0%
Victim Stranger, Acquaintance or Law Officer	Age 25 or more at commitment		28	14.3%
	Age 24 or less at commitment		14	21.4%
		Incarcerated 15 or fewer years		
		Incarcerated 16 or more years	20	55.0%
N=62 29.0% Return	N=34 41.2% Return			

APPENDIX III

VARIABLES DIFFERENTLY RELATED TO RECIDIVISM OVER THE TWO FOLLOW-UP PERIODS

Over the four-year and two-to-thirteen-year follow-up periods, two categories of results differ, criminal history and institutional behavior. One might interpret these differences as those between releasees returned soon after release and releasees returned later. The sample for the four-year follow-up includes 70 releasees, nine of whom were returned within four years of release. It excludes 22 convicted murderers released after July 1, 1965, three of whom were recidivists. It also treats six releasees as non-recidivists who were returned more than four years after release.

For the four-year follow-up, those with six or more disciplinary reports (23.1%, N=13) had a higher recidivism rate than those with one to five disciplinary reports (7.4%, N=27) or those with no disciplinary reports (13.3%, N=3). Similarly, those with one or more days of isolation had a higher recidivism rate (17.2%, N=29) than those with no days of isolation (9.8%, N=41). Thus disciplinary reports and days in isolation are similarly related to recidivism over both follow-up periods, but the relationship is much weaker over the four-year follow-up.

However, the pattern of relations between recidivism and criminal history is somewhat different over the four-year follow-up than over the two-to-thirteen-year follow-up. Over the four-year follow-up, the recidivism rate was slightly higher for those with one or more prior arrests (14.3%, N=51) than for those with no prior arrests (9.5%, N=19). It was higher for those with one or more prior arrests for offenses against property (22.2%, N=27) than for those with no such prior arrests (7.0%, N=43). It was also higher

for those with prior arrests for sex offenses (33.3%, N=3) than for those with no such prior arrests (11.9%, N=67). On the other hand, it was lower for those with some prior arrests for offenses against the person (5.0%, N=20) than for those with no such arrests (16.0%, N=50). The return rate was higher for those with two or more prior arrests for drunkenness (18.2%, N=11) and for those with no prior arrests for drunkenness (13.2%, N=53) than for those with one prior arrest for drunkenness (0.0%, N=6). Thus over both follow-up periods the recidivism rate was higher for those younger at first arrest, with some prior arrests, with none or two or more prior arrests for drunkenness, with some prior arrests for offenses against property, and with no prior arrests for offenses against the person. Those with some prior arrests for sex offenses had a higher return rate over the four-year follow-up but a very slightly lower return rate over the two-to-thirteen-year follow-up.

Those with some prior House of Correction incarcerations had a higher return rate (26.7%, N=15) than those with no prior House of Correction incarcerations (9.1%, N=55). Those with no prior juvenile incarcerations had a higher recidivism rate (14.8%, N=61) than those with some prior juvenile incarcerations (0.0%, N=9). Those with no prior state or federal incarcerations had about the same recidivism rate (13.1%, N=61) as those with some prior state or federal incarcerations (11.1%, N=9). As described in the text, having some prior juvenile incarcerations was associated with a higher return rate over the two-to-thirteen-year follow-up but no difference in the return rate over the four-year follow-up. Having some prior House of Correction incarcerations was associated with a higher return rate over the four-year follow-up but with no difference over the two-to-thirteen-year follow-up. Having some prior state or federal incarcerations was associated with a lower recidivism rate over the four-year follow-up but with a slightly higher return rate over the two-to-thirteen-year follow-up.